DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 411 902 JC 970 512

TITLE	Report of the Capital Task Force.
INSTITUTION	Illinois Community Coll. Board, Springfield.
PUB DATE	1997-09-00
NOTE	18p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Budgeting; Community Colleges; *Construction Needs; Educational Facilities Improvement; Evaluation Criteria; *Facility Requirements; Facility Utilization Research; *Financial Support; Full State Funding; Needs Assessment; School Construction; Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS	*Illinois Community College Board

ABSTRACT

The increased need for state funded construction projects in Illinois has created problems due to lack of funding. To reconcile this problem, the Capital Task Force convened to review, analyze, and assess all aspects of the current capital budgeting process, including the recommendations of the System Funding Task Force. The Task Force recommended the following needs evaluation criteria for Illinois Community College Board (ICCB) construction projects: regular evaluations of existing facilities, a more reliable means of determining utilization rates and the highest priority projects, and identification of the most productive uses of all facilities. The Task Force also recognized the need for basic common measures in assessing facility needs for all higher education institutions. Technological issues and their repercussions on education were discussed, as was the Resource Allocation & Management Program document, which provides information regarding the needs and resources of community colleges. The System Funding Task Force provided recommendations for a better means of facility comparison, including: updating capital project criteria, cooperation with the Finance Advisory Committee, modifications to its data collection system, workshops regarding capital issues, and an effective analysis of needs. Appendices include a list of Capital Task Force members, proposed amendments to Illinois Community College Board rules regarding capital project priority criteria, and a history of capital appropriations from 1980 to 1998. (YKH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 411 902

Report of the Capital Task Force

Illinois Community College Board

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
V. K. McMillan
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)"

September 1997

JC 970 512

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Report of the Capital Task Force

September 1997

Table of Contents

Page

Introduction 1

Charge to Capital Task Force 1

Review and Analysis 1

- Current Capital Budgeting Process 1
- General Issues 4
- System Funding Task Force Recommendations 5
- Illinois Community College System "Fair Share" of Higher Education State Capital Funding 6

Recommendations 7

- ICCB Capital Projects Evaluation Criteria and Procedures 7
- IBHE Capital Projects Criteria and Procedures 8
- Illinois Community College System "Fair Share" of Higher Education State Capital Funding 8

Appendix A: Capital Task Force Members 9

Appendix B: Proposed Amendments to ICCB Rules 10

Appendix C: History of Capital Appropriations 14

Introduction

During recent years the Illinois community college system has had an increased need for state-funded construction projects both for new buildings and remodeling of existing buildings, while state funding for capital projects has been very limited. As a result, the attention on capital funding issues has been very high. Community college administrators had a great interest in the Illinois Community College Board's (ICCB) and the Illinois Board of Higher Education's (IBHE) capital project criteria and processes for determining priority lists for state funding. They were also very interested in examining if the community college system was getting a "fair share" of state funds for capital projects and to identify ways that the community colleges could make a better case for its facility needs. At its September 20, 1996 meeting, the Illinois Community College Board authorized its Interim Executive Director to establish a 17-member Capital Task Force to review, analyze, and assess all aspects of the current capital budgeting process. The Task Force included six presidents, four chief finance officers, a trustee, a faculty member, a student, a facilities officer, one community college administrator, Illinois Community College Trustees Association staff, IBHE staff, and ICCB staff. The Task Force met four times since its formation in October 1996. A list of the Task Force members can be found in Appendix A of this document.

Charge to Capital Task Force

The charge to the Task Force was to review, analyze, and assess all aspects of the current capital budgeting process, including the recommendations of the System Funding Task Force, along with other concepts that the Task Force might wish to consider. A specific charge to the Task Force was to review and analyze the current ICCB and IBHE criteria for prioritizing capital construction projects for state funding and to make recommendations for any revisions or updates that may be needed. In addition, the Task Force was charged with analyzing the need for capital projects in all higher education and to determine ways that the community college system could make a stronger case for getting its "fair share" of state funds for capital projects. The Task Force was given a time line to complete its analysis and report by June 1, 1997.

Review and Analysis

Current Capital Budgeting Process

ICCB Evaluation criteria

The Task Force reviewed the ICCB evaluation criteria for construction projects. The ICCB utilizes criteria for construction projects that were established as official administrative rules and constitute a section of the *Administrative Rules of the Illinois Community College Board*. These criteria were found to be very comprehensive and specific; however, they had not been updated or revised for many years. The Task Force identified a number of criteria that were no longer relevant to the

current needs and priorities of community colleges in Illinois. For example, the criteria for determining how much land and square feet of space each college needs were found to be too prescriptive and no longer relevant. Also, the criteria specifying type of space in priority order was found to be in need of major revision. The Task Force had concerns that this criteria gave too much priority to instructional classroom/laboratory space, while lower priority was given to space use such as student services or learning resources. The Task Force felt that adequate student services space and facilities are as necessary to the basic activities of the college as is instructional space.

The Task Force also recommended a criteria that would give a priority to colleges that need to complete their core campus. This criteria would recognize that a variety of different types of facilities are needed to have a complete core campus for community college programs and services. Areas identified as comprising a core campus include classrooms, laboratories, student services, day care, learning resources/library, business and industry training services, and facilities necessary to support high enrollment programmatic areas.

The Task Force concluded that leased space should not be considered when evaluating a college's request for state-funded construction. Leased space is often obtained in conjunction with programs and activities which generate funds that pay for their own activities, and therefore, leased space should not be included in gross square footage calculations which might impact the evaluation of space needs by the college. Currently, state and locally funded permanent space is included in the gross square footage calculations. Square footage of sites with operating leases are not included in the gross square footage calculations.

The Task Force felt that capital project requests for new construction, additions, acquisitions, or remodeling/rehabilitation projects should also include an evaluation of the overall condition of existing facilities. Colleges would need to provide good documentation to show that the proposed project does not inhibit them from maintaining the overall condition of their existing facilities.

A discussion of room utilization calculations revealed some concerns that utilization rates do not include enrollments in noncredit course offerings. While current ICCB rules specify that both credit and noncredit enrollments be used in the calculation of room utilization rates, most colleges have not reported noncredit enrollments in recent years. Consequently, room utilization rates are understated when enrollments in business/industry training and community education courses are not included.

The use of the appropriate weekly hour standard to be used in calculating room utilization was also discussed. The Task Force identified a need for the utilization reports to show the peak utilization period or maximum load times for college facilities. It was noted that community colleges have to adjust their schedules around times that adult students can take classes rather than schedule classes when rooms are available. The utilization reports should reflect the percent of facility utilization at peak periods and also should include functions such as noncredit business/industry workshops and services. The Task Force concluded that the ICCB Finance Advisory Committee should analyze the current facility utilization reports and revise these reports accordingly.

The Task Force also had concerns with the student enrollments specified in the criteria for construction projects. Rather than using fall on-campus day FTE enrollments, the Task Force recommended using annual counts of credit and noncredit enrollments. The use of headcount enrollments was considered to be very appropriate for facility needs because it takes into consideration "wear and tear" on facilities. The Task Force recommended that the criteria be written in more general terms that would enable the use of several different measures of enrollments at the college. Using annual headcount, annual FTE, and a weighted headcount of full-time and part-time students was suggested.

The Task Force further recommended that the colleges' program review and PQP evaluations be considered in the construction project criteria and justification. These evaluations identify the most efficient and productive use of all resources including staff, money, and facilities. Since all of these resources are interrelated and interdependent, a PQP justification for a particular facility project is very appropriate.

ICCB rules specify that moveable equipment is eligible to receive state funds. In the past, funding for moveable equipment had not been recommended by the ICCB or IBHE. However, in more recent fiscal years, funds for moveable equipment have been recommended if included as part of a building project. Most colleges were not aware of this policy change and were not requesting funds for moveable equipment. The ICCB and IBHE have agreed that moveable equipment will be recommended for approval when it is part of a construction project request.

The Task Force spent considerable time discussing the increased need for remodeling/renovation projects within the community college system. A recent report completed by the ICCB showed a need of approximately $300 million for remodeling/renovation projects at the community colleges. Due to the aging of the facilities at community colleges, it is likely that remodeling/renovation projects will constitute an increasing proportion of the state funding for community college construction projects in future years. Many colleges will not have the resources to maintain additional space and will put a higher priority on remodeling and renovating existing space. The Task Force also considered the issue of assigning a higher priority to remodeling/renovation projects than to new construction. It was felt that neither should be given a higher priority, but that each should be evaluated on the basis of programmatic need and other criteria including enrollments.

The Task Force considered whether remodeling and renovation projects that are necessitated due to new construction should be considered in conjunction with the construction funding. Often, the acquisition of new space requires the vacating and possible renovation of existing space for other uses. When considered separately, colleges then have to wait until the remodeling project is recommended and approved, which may be several years later. It was recommended that remodeling projects that are closely linked with new construction be considered together as one combined project.

The Task Force considered what priority should be given to needed facilities for other colleges and universities to provide upper-division and graduate-level education on community college campuses. While the Task Force acknowledged a need for such facilities, it felt that the need for facilities for

community college programs and services throughout the state was a much higher priority. The Task Force recommended that shared educational centers be built with local funds and financed by rent paid by the institutions that use the facilities.

IBHE Evaluation Criteria

The Task Force was interested in reviewing the IBHE's criteria for evaluating community college capital projects. The IBHE has general policy guidelines outlined in its *Master Plan Policies for Higher Education* to evaluate community college capital projects for higher education funding. There are general policy guidelines in place for community colleges as well as for universities. The IBHE master plan policies are not as prescriptive as the community college criteria outlined in ICCB rules. The Master Plan includes the policies followed by the Board in its development of annual budget recommendations. The policies give high priority to remodeling. The policies also provide that additional classroom and laboratory space be recommended when there is a clearly demonstrated need in terms of special program requirements and the use and condition of existing space.

The Task Force would like to have IBHE develop some basic common measures that would be used for determining the facility needs for all institution of higher education. While such measures could vary by institutional type, this would provide a basic guide for determining the most critical space needs within higher education. The Task Force understands that such measures would need to be used with many other justifications for requested capital projects.

General Issues

Technology

The Task Force discussed the technological changes and advancements that continue to put pressures on the system to keep their facilities and infrastructure up to date to accommodate the changing classroom environment. There has been an increasing need to build facilities which readily adapt to the changing instructional environment and to remodel existing facilities to make use of new technologies. While the Task Force did not see a need to develop special criteria to accommodate these needs, it recognized that technological changes will be a major justification for capital projects in the community college system for many years.

The Task Force also discussed distance learning technologies and the fact that community colleges may be able to provide many classes in the future without classrooms on campus. This trend for distance learning currently appeals to students who cannot get to the campus for classes. It seems the community colleges will be serving additional students through distance learning, but will still have a great need for classroom space on campus.

RAMP

The Resource Allocation & Management Program (RAMP) is a joint IBHE and ICCB document and is submitted annually by both public universities and community colleges. This document serves

to provide valuable information regarding the needs and resources of community colleges and serves as the official request for state appropriations for capital improvements.

Square footage information submitted in this document is classified according to the National Center for Education Statistics' *Postsecondary Education Facilities Inventory and Classification Manual*. Existing square footage information submitted is utilized extensively by the ICCB in determining the need for additional space. While ICCB rules are being revised to provide more equal rankings among types of space, it may be necessary to expand the data collection effort to better identify certain space types that have been deemed high priority items. ICCB and IBHE staff have agreed that the entire RAMP document should be reviewed to see if some streamlining of the submission is possible.

ICCB and IBHE staff also stressed the importance of providing detailed programmatic and scope justifications for the projects requested in the RAMP document. A project may receive a lower ranking due to the fact that critical detail or information is lacking in the documentation that, if provided, may have generated a higher priority ranking.

In the past, the IBHE and ICCB have held joint meetings prior to the submission of the annual requests for capital projects to identify issues and concerns regarding capital issues. It was felt that such periodic meetings could be beneficial in providing leadership on capital issues and providing a better understanding of the issues to the system. New staff at colleges; changes in rules, guidelines, and procedures; and developing current issues all combine to make joint capital meetings a benefit to all involved. The Task Force suggested that the ICCB and IBHE staff provide workshops to community college staff who will be preparing capital project requests to help them address all of the criteria and to develop a good justification for their college's project.

IBHE Space Survey

Periodically, the IBHE has conducted a space survey of higher education facilities. This survey provides a good basis for facility comparison in higher education. This survey has not been updated for several years. The Task Force felt that an update of this survey would be beneficial to present an up-to-date portrait of all facilities in each sector of higher education.

System Funding Task Force Recommendations

The System Funding Task Force report included a six-part recommendation to do the following:

a) Revise the current capital budgeting process to capture more accurate data concerning capital needs and uses which will allow for the identification of other funding measures (consider establishing a separate funding category for operations and maintenance expenses).

b) Revamp the facilities file (consider age, type, and utilization of facilities).

c) Consider including leased space for which colleges are responsible in operations and maintenance calculations.
d) Review other states' literature of operations and maintenance funding.
e) Include analysis of state-funded versus total-funded space.
f) Target the fiscal year 1999 budget request for implementation.

The Task Force reviewed aspects of the capital budgeting process, facility file issues, and leased space issues. The discussion of these issues can be found in the ICCB Evaluation Criteria section of this report. All of these aspects overlap with the System Funding Task Force report recommendations with regard to how a separate funding category for operations and maintenance expenses might be established. The Task Force felt the development of a funding category for operation and maintenance expenses needs further work. Implementation of the System Funding Task Force recommendation will require a more detailed analysis and study.

Illinois Community College System "Fair Share" of Higher Education State Capital Funding

The Task Force analyzed the distribution of state construction dollars within higher education. Specifically, historical funding patterns were examined which revealed that community college construction projects received an increasing proportion of all higher education funding in recent years, yet no clear pattern of funding was evident (see History of Capital Appropriations in Appendix C). Community colleges received an average of 20.8% of higher education project funding over the last ten years and have seen an increase to 32.9% looking at a five-year average. In fiscal year 1994, community colleges received a high of 50.5% and in fiscal year 1991, a low of 6.7% of the state higher education construction funding. Community colleges would prefer to have a more objective criteria that would provide additional capital funding based on demonstrated need such as increased enrollments, new programs and services, and a more consistent proportion of funding from year to year for planning purposes. Currently, community college enrollments constitute 63% of headcount and 51% of the FTE of all students enrolled in public higher education in Illinois. An analysis of the space available in public higher education shows that public universities have much more nonresidential space per student than do community colleges. Although, it is difficult to compare institutions with different missions and very different programs, these facts certainly raise legitimate questions about whether or not community colleges are getting their "fair share" of state funding for construction projects.

After considering a number of potential percentages, the Task Force did not recommend using a "fair-share" percentage as a base for comparison. The Task Force recognized that a targeted percentage would not be meaningful in any given year because a community college might have a major project that year and a university might have a major project in another year. The Task Force did recommend that the IBHE update its Space Survey periodically and analyze the adequacy of facility needs within all sectors of higher education in Illinois. This analysis should consider the different space needs by institutional type and/or function as appropriate. This information would

be useful for institutions in justifying their capital constructional projects both at the local and state levels.

The Task Force determined that the best way to obtain a "fair share" of state funding for community college construction projects was by doing a much better job of articulating and justifying the specific capital project needs within the community college system. The presentations made by the community colleges at the legislative hearings in 1996 are good examples of how the community college system can clearly present its capital funding needs.

Recommendations

The following recommendations are made by the Task Force.

ICCB Capital Projects Evaluation Criteria and Procedures

1. The ICCB should update its capital project criteria in order to:

   A) prioritize space for instruction, study, and students equally;
   B) consider core campus needs;
   C) consider overall condition of facilities;
   D) allow use of various enrollment measures for space availability; and
   E) include college analysis of need as documented in accountability and productivity reports.

2. The ICCB should work with its Finance Advisory Committee to review and update the facility inventory and facility utilization reports so that the information presented accurately portrays the utilization of facilities at community colleges.

3. The ICCB should work with its Finance Advisory Committee to review other state's literature of operations and maintenance funding and consider establishing a separate funding category for operations and maintenance expenses.

4. The ICCB should consider modifications to its data collection system to improve its collection of noncredit enrollments in community education and business and industry courses which currently are not reported by most colleges. Uniform guidelines for reporting noncredit enrollments in community education and business and industry courses should be developed for use in facility utilization calculations.

5. The ICCB and IBHE should consider streamlining the RAMP submission process to reduce unnecessary forms and to obtain better programmatic justification of capital project requests from colleges.

6. The ICCB, in conjunction with the IBHE, should conduct workshops for community college personnel regarding capital issues, state criteria for funding capital projects, and ways to develop a project justification.

IBHE Capital Projects Criteria and Procedures

7. The IBHE should continue to accept the capital project priority listings of the ICCB.

8. The IBHE should consider using common measures of space needs that would be applied to both community college projects and university projects in addition to its other criteria in prioritizing capital projects within higher education.

9. The IBHE should participate with the ICCB in providing workshops for community college personnel regarding current capital issues, rules, guidelines, RAMP requests, and capital project request justification.

Illinois Community College System "Fair Share" of Higher Education State Capital Funding

10. The IBHE should continue to conduct its Space Survey on a three-year basis for all of higher education in Illinois and analyze the adequacy of space by institutional type or function as appropriate.

11. The IBHE should consider the results of the analysis of space needs by institutional type so that state funding for capital construction projects can address the areas with the greatest needs.

12. Each community college should make a strong case for its unique capital project needs to its residents, its legislators, and the ICCB/IBHE.

13. The Illinois community college system needs to present a strong case for the unique capital funding needs of the system to the ICCB, IBHE, and the Legislature.

Appendix A

CAPITAL TASK FORCE MEMBERS

Gary Davis	Executive Director - Illinois Community College Trustees Association
Greg Florian	Chief Financial Officer - Kaskaskia College
Tom Gamble	President - Joliet Junior College
Bob Getz	Facilities Officer - William Rainey Harper College
Ray Hancock	President - John A. Logan College
Norm Jenkins	President - Kishwaukee College
Goble Jessup	Chief Financial Officer - Lake Land College
George Jorndt	President - Triton College
Dave Maguire	Trustee - Spoon River College
Gretchen Naff	President - College of Lake County
Kevin Northrup	Faculty - Parkland College
Rick Radeke	Chief Financial Officer - Moraine Valley Community College
Norm Stephens	President - Lincoln Land Community College
Lacy Thomas	Chief Financial Officer - City Colleges of Chicago
Richard Wagner	Executive Director - Illinois Board of Higher Education
Ryan Weiss	Student - Elgin Community College
David Whitaker	Community College Administrator - Prairie State College

Appendix B

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO
ILLINOIS COMMUNITY COLLEGE BOARD RULES
REGARDING CAPITAL PROJECT PRIORITY CRITERIA

Section 1501.603 State-Funded Capital Projects

e) Project Priority Criteria. All projects must meet requirements as stated in ILCS 805/5-3 and 5-4. Capital project priorities will be established within the categories named in Section 1501.603(a) according to the following criteria:

1) New Facilities: The acquisition of buildings/additions/structures through construction of new facilities or purchase of existing facilities. Includes planning, qualifying fixed and moveable equipment as necessary to support the new facility, land acquisition required for the facility, and any site improvements or utility work necessary to support the facility. All requests for new facilities must meet the criteria specified in either Rule 1501.603(b) for new construction at a primary site or 1501.603(d) for secondary site projects.

Each of the following criteria will be considered in establishing priorities for new facilities:

A) Type of space to be constructed (in priority order):

i) Instructional, study, office and student areas (all weighted equally):

- Instructional space including basic classrooms, lecture halls, seminar rooms and other rooms used primarily for scheduled instruction, both credit and noncredit. These rooms may contain multimedia or telecommunications equipment. Space utilized as classroom service, i.e., projection rooms, telecommunication control booths, closets, etc., are included. **(FICM Codes 110 -115).** Instructional space also includes laboratory facilities, both class and open, used for instructional purposes and service areas that serve as an extension of the activities of the laboratory (**FICM Codes 210 - 255**).

- Study areas including all library facilities, any rooms or areas used by individuals at their convenience, general learning labs, and any service areas necessary to support the activities of these rooms. **(FICM Codes 410 - 455).**

- Office facilities that provide work areas to support the academic, administrative, and service functions of the colleges. Also includes rooms such as student counseling rooms and testing areas, staff conference rooms, file rooms, and break rooms **(FICM Codes 310 - 355)**.

- Student service areas include general use facilities such as child care facilities **(FICM Codes 640 and 645)**, food service facilities **(FICM Codes 630 and 635)**, lounge facilities **(FICM Codes 650 and 655)**, merchandise areas such as bookstores, student supply stores, or ticket outlet services **(FICM Codes 660 and 665)**, and rooms utilized for recreation and amusement **(FICM Codes 670 and 675)**. Meeting rooms used by the institution or the general public for a variety of nonclass meetings also are included **(FICM Codes 680 and 685)**.

ii) Support areas including central administrative computer and telecommunications rooms, maintenance shops, garages, warehouses, and storage facilities **(FICM Codes 710 - 765)**.

iii) Assembly areas including theaters, auditoriums, arenas, exhibition rooms, and concert halls used primarily for general presentations or performances. Includes areas that serve as an extension of the activities in that facility **(FICM Codes 610 - 625)**.

iv) Physical education areas used for physical education instructional programs, intercollegiate, and recreational activities. Includes areas such as gymnasia, athletic courts, swimming pools, and other special use athletic facilities **(FICM Codes 520, 523, and 525). (Does not include specific classrooms more appropriately classified under FICM code series 100.)**

v) Special use facilities not included elsewhere such as armory, armory services, media production services, clinics, etc. **(FICM Codes 510, 515, and 530-590)**.

B) Core Campus Considerations. Priorities will be assigned to colleges who do not have adequate core campus components in place. A core campus generally consists of classrooms, laboratories, student services, day care, learning resources/library, business and industry training services and facilities to support high enrollment programmatic areas.

C) Space Criteria/Considerations.

- Utilization of Existing Space. Priorities will be assigned so that the higher utilization rate generated by weekly instructional hours for credit and noncredit courses offered at permanent locations owned by the

college (college holds title, lease purchase, or purchasing contract for deed), the higher the priority will be assigned. Instructional hours are defined as those enrollments generated by students taking credit and noncredit courses.

- Space per Student. Requests for space will be assigned priorities so that the less existing permanent space per student available at facilities owned by the college (college holds title, lease purchase, or contract for deed), the higher the priority assigned to the project.

D) Program Considerations. Consideration will be given to the need for special facilities based on the programs to be housed in the requested facilities. Priorities will be assigned so that the greater the need for special facilities, the higher the priority. Criteria evaluated for need will include (not in priority order) but not be limited to:

i) Documented need as evidenced by the college's accountability and productivity reviews.
ii) Labor market demand for completers of the program (as indicated by current manpower data).
iii) Unavailability of special facilities needed for the program.
iv) Other special needs or measures as described in the program justification statement submitted by the college with the project request.

2) Remodeling or Rehabilitation of Existing Facilities. Remodeling or rehabilitation projects will be evaluated on 1) structural considerations **and/or** programmatic considerations and 2) core campus considerations, if applicable to project. Requests for remodeling or rehabilitation projects must meet the criteria specified in Rule 1501.603(c). The following criteria will establish the order of remodeling/ rehabilitation projects:

A) Structural Considerations (in priority order).

i) Those projects which will reduce physical health and safety hazards to the student body and staff (e.g., structural defects/deficiencies, handicapped modifications).
ii) Overall condition of space and/or other structural integrity considerations.
iii) Those projects which will result in financial and/or natural resource savings (e.g., energy conservation).
iv) Those projects which will result in the development of more efficient utilization of existing space.

B) Program Considerations. Consideration will be given to the need for remodeling or rehabilitation of facilities based on the programs to be housed in the facilities. Priorities will be assigned so that the greater the need for remodeling or rehabilitation the higher the priority. Criteria evaluated for need will include (not in priority order), but not be limited to:

i) Documented need as evidenced by the college's accountability and productivity reviews.
ii) Labor market demand for completers of the program (as indicated by current manpower data).
iii) Unavailability of special facilities needed for the program.
iv) Other special needs or measures as described in the program justification statement submitted by the college with the project request.

C) Core Campus Considerations. Priorities will be assigned to colleges who demonstrate the need for remodeling or rehabilitation of existing core campus components due to either structural integrity issues or increased demand for services. A core campus generally consists of classrooms, laboratories, student services, day care, learning resources/library, business and industry training services and facilities to support high enrollment programmatic areas.

3) Land. Requests for state funds for land purchases not related to new facilities acquisition will be evaluated based on the need to support existing campus facilities and services. Requests must meet applicable criteria specified in Rule 1501.603(b) for land purchases at the primary site or Rule 1501.603(d) for secondary site projects.

4) Utilities. Utilities projects (beyond a five foot perimeter of buildings) not related to new facility acquisition will be evaluated based on the need to support existing campus facilities and services.

5) Site Improvements. Site improvements not related to new facilities acquisition will be evaluated in conjunction with the facilities to which they relate and other demonstrated need.

6) Additional consideration may be given to the priority ranking of a project if it had previous ICCB approval for planning or construction.

History of Capital Appropriations
Fiscal Years 1980 - 1998*

Fiscal Year	Community Colleges Appropriation	Community Colleges % of Total	Public Universities Appropriation	Public Universities % of Total	Grand Total
1980	13,816.4	45.7%	16,407.5	54.3%	30,223.9
1981	16,302.5	46.1%	19,086.8	53.9%	35,389.3
1982	4,125.6	9.8%	37,891.7	90.2%	42,017.3
1983	0.0	0.0%	17,474.9	100.0%	17,474.9
1984	8,622.7	28.9%	21,202.3	71.1%	29,825.0
1985	5,472.1	26.5%	15,192.0	73.5%	20,664.1
1986	36,485.9	39.0%	57,031.7	61.0%	93,517.6
1987	10,581.8	15.3%	58,608.4	84.7%	69,190.2
1988	8,478.4	30.3%	19,500.5	69.7%	27,978.9
1989	4,227.5	12.4%	29,817.7	87.6%	34,045.2
1990	23,966.0	16.6%	120,565.8	83.4%	144,531.8
1991	16,730.1	6.7%	233,061.3	93.3%	249,791.4
1992	5,000.0	9.7%	46,676.1	90.3%	51,676.1
1993	18,133.6	30.9%	40,545.7	69.1%	58,679.3
1994	40,281.3	50.5%	39,557.3	49.5%	79,838.6
1995	29,515.6	22.5%	101,779.4	77.5%	131,295.0
1996	0.0	0.0%	0.0	0.0%	0.0
1997	39,443.2	33.7%	77,731.7	66.3%	117,174.9
1998	0.0	0.0%	0.0	0.0%	0.0
15-YEAR AVERAGE FY 1983 - FY 1998		**21.9%**		**78.1%**	
10-YEAR AVERAGE FY 1988 - FY 1998		**20.8%**		**79.2%**	
5-YEAR AVERAGE FY 1993 - FY 1998		**32.9%**		**67.1%**	

*Excludes capital funds for statewide intiatives, private institutions and IMSA.